



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENT  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 6

FOLEY & LARDNER  
ONE MARITIME PLAZA, SIXTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

**COPY MAILED**

JAN 21 2003

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

**ON PETITION**

In re Application of  
Adam Peter Dunn et al  
Application No. 10/057,209  
Filed: January 22, 2002  
Attorney Docket No. 059284-0146

:  
:  
:  
:  
:

This is in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a), filed September 25, 2002.

The petition is dismissed.

Rule 47 applicant is given TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this decision to reply, correcting the below-noted deficiencies. Any reply should be entitled "Request for Reconsideration of Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)," and should only address the deficiencies noted below, except that the reply may include an oath or declaration executed by the non-signing inventor. **FAILURE TO RESPOND WILL RESULT IN ABANDONMENT OF THE APPLICATION.** Any extensions of time will be governed by 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) requires: (1) proof that the non-signing inventor cannot be reached or refuses to sign the oath or declaration after having been presented with the application papers (specification, claims and drawings); (2) an acceptable oath or declaration in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 115 and 116; (3) the petition fee; and (4) a statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventor. Applicant lacks items (1), set forth above.

As to item (1), rule 47 applicant must demonstrate with documented evidence that an inventor refuses to join in the application after having been presented with the application papers (specification, claims, drawings and oath or declaration). There is no indication in the present case whether joint inventor Scott Roberts Kalkman was ever presented with a copy of the complete application papers for the instant nonprovisional application. The fact that an application may contain proprietary information does not relieve the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant of the responsibility to present the application papers to the inventor if the inventor is willing to receive the papers. If joint inventor Kalkman was not presented with a copy of the application

papers for the instant nonprovisional application, then Mr. Kalkman could not attest that he has "reviewed and understands the application papers" and could not execute the declaration he was requested to sign. While the declaration of Jason E. Lavender states that the declaration was sent to Mr. Kalkman by E-mail on September 24, 2002, it is unclear whether Mr. Kalkman was presented with a copy of the complete application papers. Did inventor Kalkman receive a copy of the application papers? Before a refusal can be alleged, it must be demonstrated that a *bona fide* attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers to the nonsigning inventor for signature. Unless petitioner can show that a copy of the application papers was presented to inventor Kalkman or that the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, then petitioner will have to mail a copy of the complete application papers (specification, claims and drawings) to inventor Kalkman's last known address, return receipt requested. A cover letter of instructions should accompany the mailing of the application papers setting a deadline or a statement that no response will constitute a refusal. This sort of ultimatum lends support to a finding of refusal by conduct. **The proof of the pertinent events should be made by a statement of someone with firsthand knowledge of the events and should include documentary evidence, such as certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instructions, telegram, etc.** See MPEP 409.03(d).

The statements of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. If the inventor orally refuses to join in the application, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the affidavit or declaration. If, on the other hand, petitioner receives an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the affidavit or declaration.

When it is concluded by the rule 47 petitioner that an omitted inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in an affidavit or declaration. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the affidavit or declaration, such evidence must be submitted.

Whenever an omitted inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the affidavit or declaration.

**In order to expedite consideration of the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a), petitioner may wish to submit the renewed petition by facsimile transmission to the telephone number indicated below and to the attention of Irvin Dingle.**

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 2327  
Mailstop DAC  
Arlington, VA 22202

Or

Commissioner for Patents  
Box DAC  
Washington, D.C. 20231

By FAX: (703) 308-6916  
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Crystal Plaza Four, Suite 3C23  
2201 S. Clark Place  
Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to Irvin Dingle at (703) 306-5684.



Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy